

EFFECTIVE BOUNDS ON SINGULAR SURFACES IN POSITIVE CHARACTERISTIC

JAKUB WITASZEK

ABSTRACT. Using the theory of Frobenius singularities, we show that $16mK_X + 56mA$ is very ample for an ample Cartier divisor A on a Kawamata log terminal surface X with Gorenstein index m , defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 5$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The positivity of line bundles is a fundamental topic of research in algebraic geometry. Showing the base point freeness or very ampleness of line bundles allows for the description of the geometry of algebraic varieties.

The motivation for this paper centers around two questions. The first one is the following: given an ample Cartier divisor A , find an effective $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for which nA is very ample. A famous theorem of Matsusaka states that one can find such $n \in \mathbb{N}$ which depends only on the Hilbert polynomial of A , when the variety is smooth and the characteristic of the field is equal to zero ([23]). This theorem plays a fundamental role in constructing moduli spaces of polarized varieties. In positive characteristic, Kollár proved the same statement for normal surfaces ([15, Theorem 2.1.2]).

The second question motivating the results of this paper is the famous Fujita conjecture, which, in characteristic zero, is proved only for curves and surfaces.

Conjecture 1.1 (Fujita conjecture). *Let X be a smooth projective variety of dimension n , and let A be an ample Cartier divisor on X . Then $K_X + (n + 2)A$ is very ample.*

Fujita-type results play a vital role in understanding the geometry of algebraic varieties.

In positive characteristic, the conjecture is known only for curves, and those surfaces which are neither of general type, nor quasi-elliptic. This follows from a result of Shepherd-Barron which says that on such surfaces, rank two vector bundles which do not satisfy Bogomolov inequality are unstable ([30, Theorem 7]). Indeed, the celebrated proof by Reider of the Fujita conjecture for characteristic zero surfaces, can be, in such a case, applied without any modifications (see [38], [24]).

Given lack of any progress for positive characteristic surfaces of general type, Di Cerbo and Fanelli undertook a different approach to the problem

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14E30, 13A35, 14B05, 14F17.

Key words and phrases. positive characteristic, F-pure singularity, surface, Fujita conjecture, Kodaira vanishing.

([6]). They proved among other things that $2K_X + 4A$ is very ample, where A is ample, and X is a smooth surface of general type in characteristic $p \geq 3$.

In this paper, we consider the aforementioned questions for singular surfaces. As far as we know, no effective bounds for singular surfaces in positive characteristic have been obtained before. The main theorem is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let X be a projective surface with Kawamata log terminal singularities defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 5$. Assume that mK_X is Cartier for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for an ample Cartier divisor A*

- $4mK_X + 14mA$ is base point free, and
- $16mK_X + 56mA$ is very ample.

In particular, Kawamata log terminal surfaces with K_X ample, and defined in characteristic $p > 5$, satisfy that $72mK_X$ is very ample, where m is the Gorenstein index.

The bounds are not sharp. See Theorem 5.1 for a slightly more general statement. Instead of assuming that X is Kawamata log terminal and $p > 5$, it is enough to assume that X is F -pure and $\mathbb{Q}$ -factorial. The theorem also holds in characteristic zero, but in such a case the existence of effective bounds follows in an easier way by Kollár’s effective base point free theorem ([16]) and the Kodaira vanishing theorem.

The proof consists of three main ingredients. First, we apply the result of Di Cerbo and Fanelli on a desingularization of X . This shows that the base locus of $2mK_X + 7mA$ is zero dimensional. Then, we apply an astonishing technique of Cascini, Tanaka and Xu (see [5, Theorem 3.8]), to construct certain “nearly- F -pure” centers, and use them to show that the base locus of $2(2mK_X + 7mA)$ is empty. The last part follows from the theorem below, which is a variation of a result of Keeler ([14, Theorem 1.1]) in the case of F -pure varieties.

Theorem 1.3. *Let X be an F -pure $\mathbb{Q}$ -factorial projective variety of dimension n and let H be an ample base point free Cartier divisor. If $H - K_X$ is ample, then $(n + 2)H + N$ is very ample for any nef Cartier divisor N .*

Theorems of a similar flavour have been obtained by Schwede ([28]), Smith ([31] and [32]) and Hara ([10]).

As far as we know, after the paper of Cascini, Tanaka and Xu had been announced, no one has yet applied their technique of constructing F -pure centers. We believe that down-to-earth examples provided in our paper may be suitable as a gentle introduction to some parts of their prolific paper, [5].

As a corollary to the main theorem, we obtain the following Matsusaka-type bounds.

Corollary 1.4. *Let A and N be, respectively, an ample and a nef Cartier divisor on a Kawamata log terminal projective surface defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 5$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that mK_X is Cartier. Then $kA - N$ is very ample for any*

$$k > \frac{2A \cdot (H + N)}{A^2} ((K_X + 3A) \cdot A + 1),$$

where $H := 16mK_X + 56mA$.

One of the fundamental conjectures in birational geometry is Borisov-Alexeev Boundedness conjecture, which says that ϵ -klt log Fano varieties are bounded. In dimension two it was proved by Alexeev ([1, Theorem 6.9]). One of the ingredients of the proof is the beforementioned result about boundedness of polarized surfaces by Kollár ([15, Theorem 2.1.2]). Further, explicit bounds on the volume have been obtained by Lai ([18, Theorem 4.3]) and Jiang ([12, Theorem 1.3]).

For characteristic $p > 5$, in the proof of the boundedness of ϵ -klt log del Pezzo pairs, we can replace Kollár's result by Theorem 1.2, and hence obtain rough, but explicit bounds on the size of the bounded family.

Corollary 1.5. *For any $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and a finite set $I \subseteq [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$, there exist effectively computable natural numbers $b(\epsilon, I)$ and $n(\epsilon, I)$ satisfying the following property.*

Let (X, Δ) be an ϵ -klt log del Pezzo surface with the coefficients of Δ contained in I . Then, there exists a very ample divisor H on X such that $H^i(X, H) = 0$ for $i > 0$ and

$$|H^2|, |H \cdot K_X|, |H \cdot \Delta|, |K_X \cdot \Delta|, |\Delta^2|$$

are smaller than $b(\epsilon, I)$. Further, H embeds X into $\mathbb{P}^k$, where $k \leq b(\epsilon, I)$, and $n(\epsilon, I)\Delta$ is Cartier.

In the proof of the above corollary we use the following theorem, which is our generalization to the singular setting of an unpublished result of Tanaka.

Theorem 1.6. *Let H and A be, respectively, a very ample and an ample Cartier divisor on a normal projective surface X . Assume that mK_X is Cartier for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $mK_X + A$ is ample. Then*

$$H^i(X, \overline{H}) = 0$$

for $i > 0$, where

- $\overline{H} := H + mK_X + A$, if $m \neq 1$,
- $\overline{H} := H + 2K_X + A$, if $m = 1$.

In particular, $H^1(X, 4K_X + 21A) = 0$ for an ample Cartier divisor A on a smooth projective surface X , since $2K_X + 20A$ is always very ample, by [6].

The paper is organized as follows.

The second section consists of basic preliminaries. In the third section we give a proof of the base point free part of the main theorem. In the fourth section we prove Theorem 1.3 and finish the proof of the main theorem. In the fifth section, we prove a technical generalization of the main theorem to arbitrary characteristic. In the sixth section we show Matsusaka-type bounds (Corollary 1.4). In the seventh section we give a proof of Theorem 1.6 closely following the idea of Tanaka. In the eight section we derive effective bounds on log del Pezzo pairs.

As far as we are concerned, the best source of knowledge about Frobenius singularities are unpublished notes of Schwede [26]. We also recommend [29].

The readers interested in Matsusaka theorem and Fujita-type theorems are encouraged to consult [21, Section 10.2 and 10.4]. Certain Fujita-type bounds for singular surfaces in characteristic zero are obtained in [19]. The effective base point free theorem in characteristic zero is proved in [16]. Various results on the base point free theorem for surfaces in positive characteristic may be found in [36] and [22].

2. PRELIMINARIES

We always work over an algebraically closed field k of positive characteristic $p > 0$.

We refer to [17] for basic definitions in birational geometry like log discrepancy or Kawamata log terminal singularities. We say that a pair (X, Δ) is a *log Fano* pair if $-(K_X + \Delta)$ is ample. In the case when $\dim(X) = 2$, we say that (X, Δ) is a *log del Pezzo* pair.

A pair (X, B) is ϵ -klt, if the log discrepancy along any divisor is greater than ϵ . Note that the notion of being 0-klt is equivalent to klt.

The *Cartier index* of (X, Δ) is the minimal number $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m(K_X + \Delta)$ is Cartier. If (X, Δ) is klt, then it must be $1/m$ -klt.

Recall that any Kawamata log terminal surface has rational singularities, and is, in particular, $\mathbb{Q}$ -factorial (see [34]).

We denote the base locus of a line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ by $\text{Bs}(\mathcal{L})$. Note, that by abuse of notation, we use the notation for line bundles and the notation for divisors interchangeably.

We will repeatedly use, without mentioning directly, that $K_X + 3A$ is nef, where X is a projective normal surface and A is an ample Cartier divisor. This is a direct consequence of the cone theorem ([34, Proposition 3.15]).

The following facts are used in the proofs in this paper.

Theorem 2.1 (Mumford regularity, [20, Theorem 1.8.5]). *Let X be a projective variety, and let M be a globally generated ample line bundle on X . Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a coherent sheaf on X such that $H^i(X, \mathcal{F} \otimes M^{-i}) = 0$ for $i > 0$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is globally generated.*

Theorem 2.2 (Fujita vanishing, [20, Theorem 1.4.35] and [20, Remark 1.4.36]). *Let X be a projective variety, and let H be an ample divisor on X . Given any coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on X , there exists an integer $m(\mathcal{F}, H)$ such that*

$$H^i(X, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(mH + D)) = 0,$$

for all $i > 0$, $m \geq m(\mathcal{F}, H)$ and any nef Cartier divisor D on X .

Theorem 2.3 (Log-concavity of volume). *For any two big Cartier divisors D_1 and D_2 on a normal variety X of dimension n we have*

$$\text{vol}(D_1 + D_2)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \text{vol}(D_1)^{\frac{1}{n}} + \text{vol}(D_2)^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

Recall that

$$\text{vol}(D) := \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H^0(X, mD)}{m^n/n!}.$$

Proof. See [6, Theorem 2.2] (cf. [21, Theorem 11.4.9] and [33]). □

2.1. Frobenius singularities. All the rings in this section are assumed to be geometric and of positive characteristic, that is finitely generated over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$.

One of the most amazing discoveries of singularity theory is that properties of the Frobenius map may reflect how singular a variety is. This observation is based on the fact that for a smooth local ring R , the e -times iterated Frobenius map $R \rightarrow F_*^e R$ splits. Further, the splitting does not need to hold when R is singular.

This leads to a definition of F -split rings, rings R such that for divisible enough $e \gg 0$ the e -times iterated Frobenius map $F^e: R \rightarrow F_*^e R$ splits. For log pairs, we have the following definition.

Definition 2.4. We say that a log pair (X, Δ) is F -pure if for any close point $x \in X$ and any natural number $e > 0$ there exists a map

$$\phi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}(F_*^e \mathcal{O}_{X,x}(\lfloor (p^e - 1)\Delta \rfloor), \mathcal{O}_{X,x})$$

such that $1 \in \phi(F_*^e \mathcal{O}_{X,x})$, where $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is the stalk at $x \in X$.

As a consequence of Grothendieck duality (see [7, Lemma 2.9]), we have

$$\text{Hom}(F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \simeq H^0(X, \omega_X^{1-p^e}).$$

This explains the following crucial proposition.

Proposition 2.5 ([27, Theorem 3.11, 3.13]). *Let X be a normal variety. Then, there is a natural bijection.*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Non-zero } \mathcal{O}_X\text{-linear maps} \\ \phi: F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \text{ up to} \\ \text{pre-multiplication by units} \end{array} \right\} \longleftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Effective } \mathbb{Q}\text{-divisors } \Delta \text{ such that} \\ (1 - p^e)\Delta \sim -(1 - p^e)K_X \end{array} \right\}$$

The $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor corresponding to a splitting $\phi: F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ will be denoted by Δ_ϕ . The morphism extends to $\phi: F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X((p^e - 1)\Delta_\phi) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$, which gives that (X, Δ_ϕ) is F -pure.

Note that we will apply the above proposition mainly for X replaced by $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$, where $x \in X$.

Frobenius singularities are alleged to be the correct counterparts of birational singularities in positive characteristic. This supposition is propped up by the following theorems.

Theorem 2.6 (see [11]). *Let (X, B) be a log pair. If (X, B) is F -pure, then (X, B) is log canonical.*

Theorem 2.7 ([9]). *Let X be a Kawamata log terminal projective surface defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 5$. Then X is F -pure.*

The above theorem implies, even more, that X is strongly F -regular. In this paper, however, we do not need the notion of F -regularity.

A key tool in the theory of Frobenius splittings is a trace map (see [35] and [28]). For an integral divisor D on a normal variety X , there is an isomorphism derived from the Grothendieck duality (see [7, Lemma 2.9]):

$$(1) \quad \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(D), \mathcal{O}_X) \simeq \mathcal{O}_X(-(p^e - 1)K_X - D).$$

Definition 2.8. Let B be a $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor such that $(p^e - 1)(K_X + B)$ is Cartier. We call

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{X,B}^e: F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-(p^e - 1)(K_X + B)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X,$$

the *trace map*. It is constructed by applying the above isomorphism (1) to the map

$$(2) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X((p^e - 1)B), \mathcal{O}_X) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$$

being the dual of the composition $\mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{F^e} F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X \hookrightarrow F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X((p^e - 1)B)$.

The rank one sheaves in question are not necessary line bundles, but since X is normal, we can always restrict ourselves to the smooth locus. The trace map can be also defined when the index of $K_X + B$ is divisible by p , but we will not need it in this paper.

The following proposition reveals the significance of the trace map.

Proposition 2.9 ([7, Proposition 2.10]). *Let (X, B) be a normal log pair such that the Cartier index of $K_X + B$ is not divisible by p . Then (X, B) is F -pure at a point $x \in X$ if and only if the trace map $\mathrm{Tr}_{X,B}^e$ is surjective at x for all enough divisible $e \gg 0$.*

For the convenience of the reader we give a proof of this proposition.

Proof. The key point is that $\mathrm{Tr}_{X,B}^e$ is induced by the evaluation map (2). Replace X by $\mathrm{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$. For $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X((p^e - 1)B), \mathcal{O}_X)$, the image $\mathrm{ev}(\phi)$ is defined by the commutativity of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{F^e} F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X((p^e - 1)B) & \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{O}_X \\ & \searrow \mathrm{ev}(\phi) & \nearrow \end{array}$$

Note that $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \simeq \mathcal{O}_X$ is generated by the identity morphism id . In particular, ev is surjective if and only if there exists ϕ such that $\mathrm{ev}(\phi) = \mathrm{id}$, which is equivalent to ϕ being a splitting. $\square$

Further, we consider another version of the trace map. Let D be a $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor such that $K_X + B + D$ is Cartier. Tensoring the trace map $\mathrm{Tr}_{X,B}^e$ by it, we obtain:

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{X,B}^e(D): F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + B + p^e D) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + B + D).$$

By abuse of notation, both versions of the trace map are denoted in the same way.

Later, we will need the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.10. *Let X be a $\mathbb{Q}$ -factorial variety, which is F -pure at a point $x \in X$. Then, there exists an effective $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor B such that*

$$(p^e - 1)(K_X + B)$$

is Cartier for enough divisible $e \gg 0$, and (X, B) is F -pure at x . One can take the coefficients of B to be as small as possible.

More precisely, if we can find B as above, then there exists a sequence $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j = 0$ such that $a_j B$ satisfies the conditions of this lemma.

Note that, if the Gorenstein index of X is not divisible by p , then one can just take $B = 0$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.5, we know that there exists an effective $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor Δ such that (X, Δ) is F -pure at $x \in X$, and the Cartier index of $K_X + \Delta$ at x is not divisible by p .

In particular, for enough divisible $e \gg 0$, there exists a $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor $D \sim (p^e - 1)(K_X + \Delta)$ such that $x \notin \text{Supp } D$. Further, we can find a Cartier divisor E disjoint with x for which $E + D$ is effective.

Notice that $K_X + \Delta + D + E \sim p^e(K_X + \Delta) + E$ has Cartier index indivisible by p for $e \gg 0$. Take

$$B = \frac{1}{p^n + 1}(\Delta + D + E)$$

for $n \gg 0$. Then

$$K_X + B \sim K_X + \Delta + D + E - \frac{p^n}{p^n + 1}(\Delta + D + E),$$

where both $K_X + \Delta + D + E$ and $p^n(\Delta + D + E)$ have Cartier indices not divisible by p . $\square$

Lemma 2.11 (c.f. [35, Lemma 2.6]). *Let X be a projective variety. Let S be an irreducible smooth divisor on it such that $\text{Supp } S \cap \text{Sing}(X) = \emptyset$, and let B and D be $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisors such that*

$$(p^e - 1)(K_X + B), \text{ and } K_X + B + D$$

are Cartier for some $e > 0$. Then, the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \rightarrow F_*^e \omega_X(B + p^e D) & \rightarrow & F_*^e \omega_X(S + B + p^e D) & \rightarrow & F_*^e \omega_S(B|_S + p^e D|_S) & \rightarrow & 0 \\ & \downarrow \text{Tr}_{X,B}^e(D) & & \downarrow \text{Tr}_{X,S+B}^e(D) & & \downarrow \text{Tr}_{S,B|_S}^e(D|_S) & \\ 0 \longrightarrow \omega_X(B + D) & \longrightarrow & \omega_X(S + B + D) & \longrightarrow & \omega_S(B|_S + D|_S) & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Proof. Let X_{sm} be the smooth locus of X . Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \rightarrow F_*^e \mathcal{O}_{X_{\text{sm}}}(-S + (p^e - 1)B) & \rightarrow & F_*^e \mathcal{O}_{X_{\text{sm}}}((p^e - 1)B) & \rightarrow & F_*^e \mathcal{O}_S((p^e - 1)B) & \rightarrow & 0 \\ & \uparrow F_{X_{\text{sm}}}^e & & \uparrow F_{X_{\text{sm}}}^e & & \uparrow F_S^e & \\ 0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_{\text{sm}}}(-S) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{X_{\text{sm}}} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_S & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Since $\mathcal{E}xt^i(\mathcal{O}_S, \omega_{X_{\text{sm}}}) = \omega_S$ for $i = 1$, and it is zero otherwise, the lemma follows by applying the functor $\mathcal{H}om(-, \omega_{X_{\text{sm}}}(B + D))$ to the above diagram and using Grothendieck duality (see (1)).

Since X is smooth along S and the commutativity is trivial on $X \setminus S$, we can extend X_{sm} to X . $\square$

2.2. Cartier isomorphism. Miraculous results in positive characteristic algebraic geometry are obtained with the Cartier isomorphism ([3, Theorem 3.5]):

$$\Omega_X^i \simeq \mathcal{H}^i(X, F_* \Omega_X^\bullet),$$

where X is a smooth projective variety and $\Omega_X^\bullet$ denotes the de Rham complex with standard differentials.

The goal of this subsection is to prove the following proposition, which we use in Section 7.

Proposition 2.12. *Let C be a smooth curve defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let Δ be an effective, and D an arbitrary $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor such that*

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta] &= 0, \\ \Delta + D &\text{ is a } \mathbb{Z}\text{-divisor, and} \\ \deg D &\geq \frac{2g(C) - 2}{p} + \deg \Delta, \end{aligned}$$

where $g(C)$ is the genus of C . Then,

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{C,\Delta}^e(D): H^0(C, K_C + \Delta + p^e D) \longrightarrow H^0(C, K_C + \Delta + D)$$

is surjective for all $e > 0$ for which $(p^e - 1)D$, or equivalently $(p^e - 1)\Delta$, is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -divisor.

Remark 2.13. The proposition above implies that if $\deg \Delta \leq g(C) - 1$ and $D = K_C + E$, where E is effective, then the trace map $\mathrm{Tr}_{C,\Delta}^e(D)$ is surjective.

When $\Delta = 0$, it has been proven by Tango ([37, Lemma 10], c.f. [28, Section 3.1]).

For the proof of Proposition 2.12 we need a more general Cartier isomorphism. When $E = \sum E_j$ is a simple normal crossing reduced divisor on X , then

$$\Omega_X^i(\log E) \simeq \mathcal{H}^i(X, F_* \Omega_X^\bullet(\log E))$$

holds (see [13]). Further, for $B = \sum r_j E_j$ such that $0 \leq r_j \leq p - 1$, it is true that the following inclusion of complexes of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules

$$F_* \Omega_X^\bullet(\log E) \longrightarrow F_*(\Omega_X^\bullet(\log E)(B))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism (see [8, Lemma 3.3], [26, Lemma 23.4]). All the above implies:

Theorem 2.14 ([26], [13], [8]). *Let X be a smooth projective variety defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let E be a reduced simple normal crossing divisor on X . Let $B = \sum r_j E_j$ be an effective integral divisor supported on E such that $0 \leq r_j \leq p - 1$. Then, there exists a quasi-isomorphism*

$$\Omega_X^i(\log E) \simeq \mathcal{H}^i(X, F_*(\Omega_X^\bullet(\log E)(B))).$$

Now, we can proceed with the proof.

Proof of Proposition 2.12. Let $e > 0$ be such that $(p^e - 1)D$ and $(p^e - 1)\Delta$ are Cartier. Fix $0 \leq k \leq e$. By the enhanced Cartier isomorphism (Theorem 2.14), we get the following exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow \overbrace{F_* \mathcal{O}_C(B) \rightarrow F_* \mathcal{O}_C(K_C + E + B)}^{F_* \Omega_X^\bullet(\log E)(B)} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C(K_C + E) \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B &= [p^{k+1}\Delta] - p[p^k\Delta], \text{ and} \\ E &= \mathrm{Supp} B. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the sequence consists only of vector bundles, because C is smooth, and so $F_*\mathcal{O}_C$ is free.

Set $\Delta_k = p^k\Delta - [p^k\Delta]$. Observe that $\Delta_e = \Delta_0 = \Delta$. Applying the functor

$$\mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{O}_C(K_C + \Delta_k + p^k D))$$

to the exact sequence, and using Grothendieck duality (1), we get a sequence:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leftarrow \mathcal{O}_C(K_C + \Delta_k + p^k D) &\xleftarrow{\text{Tr}_k} F_*\mathcal{O}_C(K_C + \Delta_{k+1} + p^{k+1} D) \\ &\leftarrow F_*\mathcal{O}_C(-E + \Delta_{k+1} + p^{k+1} D) \leftarrow \mathcal{O}_C(-E + \Delta_k + p^k D) \leftarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

It is exact, because a dualization of an exact sequence consisting only of vector bundles is exact.

Since $\Delta_e = \Delta_0 = \Delta$, we can decompose $\text{Tr}_{C,\Delta}^e(D)$ into a composition of the maps Tr_k :

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(C, K_C + \Delta_e + p^e D) &\xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_{e-1}} H^0(C, K_C + \Delta_{e-1} + p^{e-1} D) \longrightarrow \dots \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_0} H^0(C, K_C + \Delta_0 + D). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we are left to show that Tr_k is surjective. By chasing the corresponding long exact sequences, it is easy to see that the surjectivity of Tr_k follows from the following vanishings

$$\begin{aligned} H^2(C, \mathcal{O}_C(-E + \Delta_k + p^k D)) &= 0, \text{ and} \\ H^1(C, \mathcal{O}_C(-E + \Delta_{k+1} + p^{k+1} D)) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The former is a consequence of $\dim C = 1$. Applying Serre duality to the latter cohomology, we see that to show its vanishing it is enough to prove that

$$2g(C) - 2 + \deg E - \deg \Delta_{k+1} - p^{k+1} \deg D < 0$$

This follows from the assumptions, given that $\deg \Delta_{k+1} \geq 0$ and $\deg E \leq \deg [p^{k+1}\Delta]$. $\square$

2.3. Reider's analysis. Reider's analysis is a method of showing that divisors of the form $K_X + L$ are globally generated or very ample, where L is a big and nef divisor on a smooth surface X .

The idea is that a base point of $K_X + L$ provides us with a rank two vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ which does not satisfy Bogomolov inequality $c_1(\mathcal{E})^2 \leq 4c_2(\mathcal{E})$. In characteristic zero such vector bundles are unstable. Using the instability, one can deduce a contradiction to the existence of a base point, when L is “numerically-ample enough”.

In positive characteristic, the aforementioned fact about unstable vector bundles, has been proved by Shepherd-Barron ([30]) for surfaces which are neither of general type nor quasi-elliptic of Kodaira dimension one. This leads to the following.

Proposition 2.15 ([38, Theorem 2.4]). *Let X be a smooth projective surface neither of general type nor quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$, and let D be a nef divisor such that $D^2 > 4$. Assume that $q \in X$ is a base-point of $K_X + D$. Then, there exists an integral curve C containing q , such that $D \cdot C \leq 1$.*

In particular, for such surfaces, $K_X + 3A$ is base point free for an ample divisor A .

The goal of this subsection is to prove the following proposition, which covers all types of surfaces.

Proposition 2.16. *Let X be a smooth projective surface, and let D be a nef and big divisor on it. Assume that $q \in S$ is a base point of $K_X + D$. Further, suppose that*

- (1) $D^2 > 4$, if X is quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$,
- (2) $D^2 > \text{vol}(K_X) + 4$, if X is of general type and $p \geq 3$,
- (3) $D^2 > \text{vol}(K_X) + 6$, if X is of general type and $p = 2$, or
- (4) $D^2 > 4$, otherwise.

Then, there exists a curve C containing q such that

- (1a) $D \cdot C \leq 5$, if X is quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$ and $p = 3$,
- (1b) $D \cdot C \leq 7$, if X is quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$ and $p = 2$,
- (2) $D \cdot C \leq 1$, if X is of general type and $p \geq 3$,
- (3) $D \cdot C \leq 7$, if X is of general type and $p = 2$, or
- (4) $D \cdot C \leq 1$, otherwise.

Note that the case (4) is nothing else but Proposition 2.15. The proof follows step-by-step the proof by Di Cerbo and Fanelli ([6]). The only addition is that we show that the curve C must contain q . This chain of ideas partially traces back to Sakai ([25]).

The following is crucial in the proof of Proposition 2.16.

Proposition 2.17 ([6]). *Consider a birational morphism $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ between smooth projective surfaces X and Y which are either of general type, or quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$. Let $\overline{D}$ be a big divisor on Y such that $H^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(-\overline{D})) \neq 0$ and $\overline{D}^2 > 0$. Further, suppose that $D := \pi_* \overline{D}$ is nef, and*

- (1) $\overline{D}^2 > \text{vol}(K_X)$, if X is of general type and $p \geq 3$, or
- (2) $\overline{D}^2 > \text{vol}(K_X) + 2$, if X is of general type and $p = 2$.

Then, there exists a non-zero non-exceptional effective divisor $\overline{E}$ on Y , such that

$$\begin{aligned} k\overline{D} - 2\overline{E} &\text{ is big,} \\ (k\overline{D} - \overline{E}) \cdot \overline{E} &\leq 0, \text{ and} \\ 0 \leq D \cdot E &\leq \frac{k\alpha}{2} - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $E := \pi_* \overline{E}$, $\alpha := D^2 - \overline{D}^2$, and

- $k = 3$, if X is quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$ and $p = 3$,
- $k = 4$, if X is quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$ and $p = 2$,
- $k = 1$, if X is of general type and $p \geq 3$, or
- $k = 1$ or $k = 4$, if X is of general type and $p = 2$.

Proof. It follows directly from [6, Proposition 4.3], [6, Theorem 4.4], [6, Proposition 4.6] and [6, Corollary 4.8]. $\square$

Further, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.18 ([25, Lemma 2]). *Let D be a nef and big divisor on a smooth surface S . If*

$$D \equiv D_1 + D_2$$

for numerically non-trivial pseudo-effective divisors D_1 and D_2 , then $D_1 \cdot D_2 > 0$.

Now, we can proceed with the proof of the main proposition in this subsection.

Proof of Proposition 2.16. The first case is covered by Proposition 2.15, so we may assume that X is of general type or quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$.

Let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a blow-up at $q \in X$ with the exceptional curve F . Given that q is a base point of $K_X + D$, from the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(\underbrace{\pi^*(K_X + D) - F}_{K_Y + \pi^*D - 2F}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(\pi^*(K_X + D)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_F(\pi^*(K_X + D)) \rightarrow 0$$

we obtain that

$$H^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(-\pi^*D + 2F)) = H^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \pi^*D - 2F)) \neq 0.$$

Set $\overline{D} := \pi^*D - 2F$. Since

$$\overline{D}^2 = D^2 - 4,$$

we have $\overline{D}^2 > 0$, and the assertions (1) and (2) in Proposition 2.17 are satisfied. Further, using that $H^0(Y, \overline{D}) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D) \otimes m_q^2)$ and $\text{vol}(D) > 4$, one can easily check that $\overline{D}$ is big. Hence, by Proposition 2.17, there exists a non-zero non-exceptional effective divisor $\overline{E}$ on Y , such that

$$\begin{aligned} k\overline{D} - 2\overline{E} &\text{ is big, and} \\ (k\overline{D} - \overline{E}) \cdot \overline{E} &\leq 0, \text{ and} \\ 0 &\leq D \cdot E \leq 2k - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $E = \pi_*\overline{E}$.

To finish the proof, it is enough to show that $\overline{E}$ contains a component, which intersects F properly. Its pushforward onto X would be the sought-for curve C .

Assume that the claim is not true, that is $\overline{E} = \mu^*E + aF$ for $a \geq 0$. We have that

$$0 \geq (k\overline{D} - \overline{E}) \cdot \overline{E} = (kD - E) \cdot E + (2k + a)a.$$

This implies $kD \cdot E \leq E^2$. Since $D \cdot E \geq 0$, it holds that $E^2 \geq 0$. Given $kD - 2E$ is big, we may apply Lemma 2.18 with $kD = (kD - 2E) + 2E$, and obtain $kD \cdot E > 2E^2$. This is a contradiction with the other inequalities in this paragraph. $\square$

3. BASE POINT FREENESS

The goal of this section is to prove the base point free part of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 3.1. *Let L be an ample Cartier divisor on a normal projective surface X . Let $\pi: \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ be the minimal resolution of singularities. Then $K_{\tilde{X}} + 3\pi^*L$ is nef, and $K_{\tilde{X}} + n\pi^*L$ is nef and big for $n \geq 4$.*

Proof. Take a curve C . We need to show that $(K_{\tilde{X}} + 3\pi^*L) \cdot C \geq 0$. If $K_{\tilde{X}} \cdot C \geq 0$, then the inequality clearly holds. Thus, by cone theorem ([34, Theorem 3.13] and [34, Remark 3.14]), we need to prove it, when C is an extremal ray satisfying $K_{\tilde{X}} \cdot C < 0$. In such a case, we have that $K_{\tilde{X}} \cdot C \geq -3$.

If C is not an exceptional curve, then $3\pi^*L \cdot C \geq 3$, and so the inequality holds. But C cannot be exceptional, because then its contraction would give a smooth surface (see [17, Theorem 1.28]), and so $\tilde{X}$ would not be a minimal resolution. This concludes the first part of the lemma.

As for the second part, $K_{\tilde{X}} + n\pi^*L$ is big and nef for $n \geq 4$, since adding a nef divisor to a big and nef divisor gives a big and nef divisor. $\square$

The following proposition yields the first step in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 3.2. *Let X be a normal projective surface defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 3$. Assume that mK_X is Cartier for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let A be an ample Cartier divisor on X . Then*

$$\text{Bs}(m(aK_X + bA) + N) \subseteq \text{Sing}(X),$$

for any nef Cartier divisor N , where $a = 2$ and $b = 7$.

The proposition is even true for $a = 2$ and $b = 6$, but in this case, $aK_X + bA$ need not be ample.

Proof. Let $\pi: \overline{X} \rightarrow X$ be the minimal resolution of singularities with the exceptional locus E . First, we claim that

$$\text{Bs}(2K_{\overline{X}} + 7\pi^*A + M) \subseteq E.$$

for any nef Cartier divisor M on $\overline{X}$. Assume this is true. Since $2K_{\overline{X}} + 7\pi^*A$ is nef by Lemma 3.1, setting $M = (m-1)(2K_{\overline{X}} + 7\pi^*A) + \pi^*N$ yields

$$\text{Bs}(m(2K_{\overline{X}} + 7\pi^*A) + \pi^*N) \subseteq E,$$

and so $\text{Bs}(m(2K_X + 7A) + N) \subseteq \pi(E)$, which concludes the proof.

Hence, we are left to show the claim. Assume by contradiction that there exists a base point $q \in \overline{X}$ of $2K_{\overline{X}} + 7\pi^*A + M$ such that $q \notin E$.

We apply Proposition 2.16 for $D = K_{\overline{X}} + 7\pi^*A + M$. The assumptions are satisfied, because, by Lemma 3.1, D is big and nef, and, by Theorem 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(D) &\geq \text{vol}(K_{\overline{X}}) + 49, \text{ if } X \text{ is of general type, and} \\ \text{vol}(D) &\geq \text{vol}(K_{\overline{X}} + 4\pi^*A) + \text{vol}(3\pi^*A) > 9 \text{ in general.} \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used that $K_{\overline{X}} + 4\pi^*A$ is nef and big by Lemma 3.1.

Therefore, there exists a curve C containing q such that

$$C \cdot D \leq 1.$$

We can write $D = (K_{\overline{X}} + 3\pi^*A + M) + 4\pi^*A$. As C is not exceptional, $C \cdot \pi^*A > 0$. Thus, we obtain a contradiction. $\square$

Applying above Proposition 3.2 and Theorem 2.7, the base point free part of Theorem 1.2 follows from the following proposition by taking $L := m(aK_X + bA) - K_X$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let X be an F -pure $\mathbb{Q}$ -factorial projective surface defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let L be an ample $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on X such that $K_X + L$ is an ample Cartier divisor and*

$$\text{Bs}(K_X + L + M) \subseteq \text{Sing}(X),$$

for every nef Cartier divisor M . Then $2(K_X + L) + N$ is base point free for every nef Cartier divisor N .

If we assume that $\dim \text{Bs}(K_X + L + M) = 0$, then the same proof will give us that $3(K_X + L) + N$ is base point free.

Before proceeding with the proof, we would like to give an example explaining our strategy in characteristic zero.

Remark 3.4. Here, X is a smooth surface defined over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic zero, and L is an ample Cartier divisor on it. The goal of this remark is to prove:

if $K_X + L$ is ample and $\dim \text{Bs}(K_X + L) = 0$, then $3(K_X + L)$ is base point free.

Take any point $q \in \text{Bs}(K_X + L)$. It is enough to show that $3(K_X + L)$ is base point free at q . By assumptions, $K_X + L$ defines a finite map outside of its zero dimensional base locus, and so there exist divisors $D_1, D_2, D_3 \in |K_X + L|$ without common components such that the multiplier ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}(X, \Delta)$ for $\Delta = \frac{2}{3}(D_1 + D_2 + D_3)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{I}(X, \Delta) &= 0, \text{ and} \\ q &\in \mathcal{I}(X, \Delta). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 2(K_X + L)$.

Let W be a zero-dimensional subscheme defined by $\mathcal{I}(X, \Delta)$. We have the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(3(K_X + L)) \otimes \mathcal{I}(X, \Delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(3(K_X + L)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_W(3(K_X + L)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $3(K_X + L) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_X + \Delta + L$, by Nadel vanishing theorem ([21, Theorem 9.4.17])

$$H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(3(K_X + L)) \otimes \mathcal{I}(X, \Delta)) = 0,$$

and so

$$H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(3(K_X + L))) \longrightarrow H^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(3(K_X + L)))$$

is surjective. Since $\dim W = 0$, we get that $3(K_X + L)$ is base point free along W , and so it is base point free at q .

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Take an arbitrary closed point $q \in X$. We need to show that $q \notin \text{Bs}(2(K_X + L) + N)$. By taking $M = K_X + L + N$ in the assumption, we get that $\text{Bs}(2(K_X + L) + N) \subseteq \text{Sing}(X)$. Hence, we can assume $q \in \text{Sing}(X)$.

By assumptions, $K_X + L$ defines a finite map outside of its zero dimensional base locus, so there exist divisors $D_1, D_2 \in |K_X + L|$ such that

$\dim(D_1 \cap D_2) = 0$ and $q \in D_1 \cap D_2$. Let W be the scheme defined by the intersection of D_1 and D_2 . By definition, $I_W = I_{D_1} + I_{D_2}$.

By Theorem 2.2, we can choose $e > 0$ such that

$$H^1\left(X, \mathcal{O}_X\left(\frac{p^e - 1}{2}L + M\right) \otimes I_W\right) = 0$$

for any nef Cartier divisor M .

By Lemma 2.10, we know that there exists an effective $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor B such that

$$(p^e - 1)(K_X + B)$$

is Cartier, and

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{X,B}: F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-(p^e - 1)(K_X + B)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$$

is surjective at q , for enough divisible $e \gg 0$. If the Gorenstein index of X is not divisible by p , then we can take $B = 0$. Further, we may assume that $\frac{1}{2}L - B$ is ample.

Now, take maximal $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{X,\Delta}: F_*^e \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$$

is surjective at the stalk $\mathcal{O}_{X,q}$, where

$$\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{O}_X(-(p^e - 1)(K_X + B) - \lambda_1 D_1 - \lambda_2 D_2), \text{ and}$$

$$\Delta := B + \frac{\lambda_1}{p^e - 1}D_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{p^e - 1}D_2.$$

We want to show the existence of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_*^e \mathcal{L} & \longrightarrow & F_*^e (\mathcal{L}|_W) \\ \downarrow \mathrm{Tr}_{X,\Delta} & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{X,q}/m_q \end{array}$$

To show that such a diagram exists we need to prove that the image of $F_*^e (\mathcal{L} \otimes I_W)$ under $\mathrm{Tr}_{X,\Delta}$ is contained in m_q . This follows from the fact that $I_W = \mathcal{O}(-D_1) + \mathcal{O}(-D_2)$ and from the maximality of λ_1, λ_2 . More precisely the image of

$$F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-(p^e - 1)(K_X + B) - (\lambda_1 + 1)D_1 - \lambda_2 D_2)$$

must be contained in m_q , and analogously for λ_2 replaced by $\lambda_2 + 1$.

So, we tensor this diagram by the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta + H)$, where

$$H := 2(K_X + L) - (K_X + \Delta) + N,$$

and take H^0 to obtain the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(X, F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta + p^e H)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta + H)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(q, \mathcal{O}_{X,q}/m_q), \end{array}$$

Note that $K_X + \Delta + H = 2(K_X + L) + N$. Further, by Theorem 2.6, (X, Δ) is log canonical at $q \in X$, and so by Lemma 3.5 we get

$$\frac{\lambda_1}{p^e - 1} + \frac{\lambda_2}{p^e - 1} \leq 1.$$

Therefore, H is ample and

$$K_X + \Delta + p^e H \sim \frac{p^e - 1}{2} L + \underbrace{(p^e - 1) \left(\frac{1}{2} L - B \right) + (p^e + 1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(K_X + L) + p^e N}_{\text{nef}}.$$

The right vertical arrow is surjective, since $\text{Tr}_{X, \Delta}: F_*^e \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ is surjective, and $\dim W = 0$. The upper horizontal arrow is surjective as

$$H^1 \left(X, \mathcal{O}_X \left(\frac{p^e - 1}{2} L + M \right) \otimes I_W \right) = 0$$

for any nef Cartier divisor M . Thus, the lower horizontal arrow is surjective, and so the proof of the base point freeness is completed. $\square$

The following lemma was used in the proof.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $(X, B + a_1 D_1 + a_2 D_2)$ be a log canonical two dimensional pair, such that B is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor, $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and D_1 together with D_2 are Cartier divisors intersecting at a singular point $x \in X$. Then $a_1 + a_2 \leq 1$.*

Of course, the lemma is not true, when x is a smooth point.

Proof. Consider a minimal resolution of singularities $\pi: \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$. Write

$$K_{\tilde{X}} + \Delta_{\tilde{X}} + \pi^*(B + a_1 D_1 + a_2 D_2) = \pi^*(K_X + B + a_1 D_1 + a_2 D_2).$$

Since π is a minimal resolution, we have that $\Delta_{\tilde{X}} \geq 0$.

Take an exceptional curve C over x . Since D_1 and D_2 are Cartier, the coefficient of C in $\Delta_{\tilde{X}} + \pi^*(B + a_1 D_1 + a_2 D_2)$ is greater or equal $a_1 + a_2$. Since $(X, \Delta_{\tilde{X}} + \pi^*(B + a_1 D_1 + a_2 D_2))$ is log canonical, this concludes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

4. VERY AMPLENESS

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3. In order to explain the strategy, we start with the following example. This is a beautiful proof by Smith.

Remark 4.1 ([31], c.f. [28, Theorem 3.8]). Let X be an n -dimensional smooth projective variety defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let L be a Cartier divisor on it. The goal of this example is to prove that:

if L is ample and base point free, then $K_X + (n+1)L$ is base point free.

First, notice that by Theorem 2.1, $F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X((n+1)L)$ is a globally generated coherent sheaf for $e \gg 0$, given that

$$H^i(X, F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X((n+1-i)L)) = H^i(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + p^e(n+1-i)L)) = 0,$$

for $0 < i \leq n$, where the last equality follows from Serre vanishing.

Since X is smooth, the trace map

$$\mathrm{Tr}_X^e(L): F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X((n+1)L) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X((n+1)L)$$

is surjective (see Proposition 2.9) and, as the former sheaf is globally generated, so is the latter one.

Now, we proceed with the proof of Theorem 1.3. A similar strategy was considered in [14]. We also apply Mumford regularity, but for a different version of the trace map. Further, since we work on singular varieties, we cannot use that $F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X$ is flat.

The following proposition is based on a train of ideas from [20], but we need to perform a careful analysis of Tor modules.

Proposition 4.2 (c.f. [20, Examples 1.8.18 and 1.8.22]). *Let X be a normal projective variety of dimension n . Consider a coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ and a point $x \in X$. Let B be a globally generated ample line bundle. If*

$$H^{i+k-1}(X, \mathcal{F} \otimes B^{-(i+k)}) = 0,$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$, then $\mathcal{F} \otimes m_x$ is globally generated.

Proof. Set $\mathcal{F}(-i) := \mathcal{F} \otimes B^{-i}$. Our goal is to prove that

$$H^i(X, \mathcal{F}(-i) \otimes m_x) = 0$$

for all $i > 0$. Then, Theorem 2.1 would imply the global generatedness of $\mathcal{F} \otimes m_x$.

Since B is ample and globally generated, it defines a finite map and so there exist sections $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n \in H^0(X, B)$ intersecting in a zero dimensional scheme W containing x . We claim the following.

Claim $H^i(X, \mathcal{F}(-i) \otimes I_W) = 0$.

Assuming the claim, we prove the proposition. Consider the following short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow I_W \longrightarrow m_x \longrightarrow m_x/I_W \longrightarrow 0,$$

and tensor it by $\mathcal{F}(-i)$, to get a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(-i) \otimes I_W \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(-i) \otimes m_x \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(-i) \otimes (m_x/I_W) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where the term

$$\mathcal{G} := \ker(\mathcal{F}(-i) \otimes I_W \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(-i) \otimes m_x)$$

comes from the fact that $\mathcal{F}$ may not be flat. Since m_x/I_W is flat off W , we have that

$$\dim \mathrm{Supp}(\mathrm{Tor}^1(\mathcal{F}(-i), m_x/I_W)) = 0,$$

and so $\dim \mathrm{Supp}(\mathcal{G}) = 0$. Simple diagram chasing (similar to the proof of Lemma 4.3), shows that $H^i(X, \mathcal{F}(-i) \otimes m_x) = 0$ for $i > 0$, and so we are done.

We are left to show the claim. In order to do this, we take $U := B^{\oplus n}$ and consider a Koszul complex induced by the map $U^* \rightarrow I_W$ coming from the sections $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n$:

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigwedge^n U^* \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow \bigwedge^1 U^* \longrightarrow I_W \longrightarrow 0.$$

By [20, Appendix B2], the complex is exact off W . We tensor it by $\mathcal{F}(-i)$. Since on $X \setminus \text{Supp}(W)$ the sequence consists of free objects, tensoring by $\mathcal{F}(-i)$ is exact there, and so the homologies of the sequence $\mathcal{F}(-i) \otimes \bigwedge^\bullet U^*$ are supported on W . Hence, we can apply Lemma 4.3, and so to show that

$$H^i(X, \mathcal{F}(-i) \otimes I_W) = 0,$$

it is enough to know that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= H^{i+k-1}\left(X, \mathcal{F}(-i) \otimes \bigwedge^k U^*\right) \\ &= H^{i+k-1}\left(X, \mathcal{F}(-i-k)\right)^{\oplus \binom{n}{k}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Choose a point $q \in X$. To prove the theorem, it is enough to show that $\mathcal{O}_X((n+2)H+N) \otimes m_x$ is globally generated at q for all $x \in X$.

By Lemma 2.10, we know that there exists an effective $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor B such that

$$(p^e - 1)(K_X + B)$$

is Cartier, and

$$F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-(p^e - 1)(K_X + B)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$$

is surjective at q , for enough divisible $e \gg 0$. If the Gorenstein index of X is not divisible by p , then we can take $B = 0$. Further, we may assume that $H - K_X - B$ is ample.

By the above, the morphism

$$F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-(p^e - 1)(K_X + B) + p^e((n+2)H + N)) \otimes m_x \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X((n+2)H + N) \otimes m_x$$

is surjective at q . It implies that in order to show the global generatedness of

$$\mathcal{O}_X((n+2)H + N) \otimes m_x$$

at q , it is enough to show that

$$F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-(p^e - 1)(K_X + B) + p^e((n+2)H + N)) \otimes m_x$$

is globally generated. And this follows from Proposition 4.2, since by Serre vanishing:

$$\begin{aligned} &H^{i+k-1}\left(X, F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-(p^e - 1)(K_X + B) + p^e((n+2)H + N)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-(k+i)H)\right) \\ &= H^{i+k-1}\left(X, \mathcal{O}_X((p^e - 1)(H - K_X - B) + H + p^e((n+1-k-i)H + N))\right) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for $e \gg 0$ and all $i, k > 0$ such that $i + k - 1 \leq n$. □

The following lemma was used in the above proof.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $A^\bullet$ be a bounded complex of sheaves on a scheme X such that $A^{-i} = 0$ for $i > 0$ and $A^1 \rightarrow A^0$ is surjective. Assume that $\mathcal{H}^i(A^\bullet)$ are supported on a zero dimensional scheme for each $i \geq 0$ and $H^{i+k-1}(X, A_k) = 0$ for $i, k > 0$. Then $H^i(X, A_0) = 0$.*

Proof. Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\cdots & \rightarrow & A_4 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & A_3 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & A_2 \xrightarrow{\quad} A_1 \rightarrow A_0 \rightarrow 0 \\
& & \searrow & & \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow \searrow \\
& & K_3 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & I_2 \rightarrow K_2 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & I_1 \rightarrow K_1 \\
& \nearrow & \searrow & \nearrow & \searrow & \nearrow & \searrow \\
0 & & H_3 & \rightarrow & 0 & & H_2 \rightarrow 0 \\
& & \searrow & & \searrow & & \searrow \\
& & 0 & & 0 & & 0
\end{array}$$

Here, K_i is a kernel of $A_i \rightarrow A_{i-1}$. Further, I_i is the image of $A_{i+1} \rightarrow K_i$, and H_i is the cohomology of $A^\bullet$ at the i -th position.

Note that $H^i(X, H_j) = 0$ for $i, j > 0$, since H_j is supported on a zero dimensional scheme.

Now, to show the vanishing of $H^i(X, A_0)$ it is enough to show that $H^{i+1}(X, K_1) = 0$, as we have the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow K_1 \longrightarrow A_1 \longrightarrow A_0 \longrightarrow 0$$

and we know that $H^i(X, A_1) = 0$.

Using the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow I_1 \longrightarrow K_1 \longrightarrow H_1 \longrightarrow 0$$

we reduce to showing that $H^{i+1}(X, I_1) = 0$. The same way, using

$$0 \longrightarrow K_2 \longrightarrow A_2 \longrightarrow I_1 \longrightarrow 0,$$

we reduce to showing that $H^{i+2}(X, K_2) = 0$. Now, the argument goes in exactly the same manner. $\square$

Now, the proof of the main theorem is straightforward.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. It follows directly from Theorem 2.7, Proposition 3.2, Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 1.3. $\square$

5. GENERALIZATIONS OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section we present a technical generalisation of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 5.1. *Let X be an F -pure $\mathbb{Q}$ -factorial projective surface defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. Assume that mK_X is Cartier for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let L be an ample Cartier divisor on X and let N be any nef Cartier divisor. The following holds.*

- *If X is neither of general type nor quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$, then $2mK_X + 8mL + N$ is base point free, and $8mK_X + 32mL + N$ is very ample.*
- *If $p = 3$ and X is quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$, then $2mK_X + 12mL + N$ is base point free, and $8mK_X + 48mL + N$ is very ample.*
- *If $p = 2$ and X is quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$, then $2mK_X + 16mL + N$ is base point free, and $8mK_X + 64mL + N$ is very ample.*

- If $p \geq 3$ and X is of general type, then
 $4mK_X + 14mL + N$ is base point free, and
 $16mK_X + 56mL + N$ is very ample.
- If $p = 2$ and X is of general type, then
 $4mK_X + 22mL + N$ is base point free, and
 $16mK_X + 88mL + N$ is very ample.

The bounds are rough. The theorem is a direct consequence of the following proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *Let X be a normal projective surface defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. Assume that mK_X is Cartier for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let A be an ample Cartier divisor on X . Then*

$$\text{Bs}(m(aK_X + bA) + N) \subseteq \text{Sing}(X),$$

for any nef Cartier divisor N , where

- $a = 1, b = 4$, if X is neither of general type nor quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$,
- $a = 1, b = 6$, if X is quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$ and $p = 3$,
- $a = 1, b = 8$, if X is quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$ and $p = 2$,
- $a = 2, b = 7$, if X is of general type and $p \geq 3$,
- $a = 2, b = 11$, if X is of general type and $p = 2$.

Proof. This follows from Proposition 2.16, by exactly the same proof as of Proposition 3.2. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. This follows directly from Theorem 2.7, Proposition 5.2, Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 1.3. $\square$

6. MATSUSAKA-TYPE BOUNDS

The goal of this section is to prove Corollary 1.4. The key part of the proof is the following proposition.

Proposition 6.1. *Let A be an ample Cartier divisor and let N be a nef Cartier divisor on a normal projective surface X . Then $kA - N$ is nef for any*

$$k \geq \frac{2A \cdot N}{A^2}((K_X + 3A) \cdot A + 1) + 1.$$

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as [6, Theorem 3.3]. The only difference is that for singular surfaces, the cone theorem is weaker, so we have $K_X + 3D$ in the statement, instead of $K_X + 2D$. $\square$

The following proof is exactly the same as of [6, Theorem 1.2].

Proof of Proposition 1.4. By Theorem 1.2, we know that H is very ample. By the above proposition, we know that $kA - (H + N)$ is a nef Cartier divisor. Thus, by the proof of Theorem 1.2

$$H + \underbrace{(kA - (H + N))}_{\text{nef}} = kA - N$$

is very ample. $\square$

Applying Theorem 5.1, we obtain the following.

Corollary 6.2. *Let A and N be respectively an ample and a nef Cartier divisor on an F -pure $\mathbb{Q}$ -factorial projective surface defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that mK_X is Cartier. Then $kA - N$ is very ample for any*

$$k > \frac{2A \cdot (H + N)}{A^2} ((K_X + 3A) \cdot A + 1),$$

where

- $H := 8m(K_X + 4A)$, if X is neither quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$, nor of general type,
- $H := 8m(K_X + 6A)$, if X is quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$ and $p = 3$,
- $H := 8m(K_X + 8A)$, if X is quasi-elliptic with $\kappa(X) = 1$ and $p = 2$,
- $H := 8m(2K_X + 7A)$, if X is of general type and $p \geq 3$,
- $H := 8m(2K_X + 11A)$, if X is of general type and $p = 2$.

7. EFFECTIVE VANISHING OF H^1

The goal of this section is to present the proof of Theorem 1.6. It is a generalization of an unpublished result of Tanaka to the singular setting. The proof contained in this section follows very closely the original proof by Tanaka. The main new ingredient provided by us is Proposition 2.12.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Assume that $m \neq 1$. The proof for $m = 1$ is analogous. Notice, that since $mK_X + A$ is ample, so is $(m - 1)K_X + A$ and $(m - 2)K_X + A$. We claim that

$$H^1(X, kH + mK_X + A) \simeq H^1(X, (k + 1)H + mK_X + A)$$

for all $k \geq 1$. This claim, together with Serre vanishing, concludes the proof.

Since H is very ample, we can assume that it is a smooth irreducible curve such that $\text{Supp } H \cap \text{Sing}(X) = \emptyset$.

Take an effective $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor B such that

- $(p^e - 1)(K_X + B)$ is Cartier for divisible enough $e \gg 0$,
- $(m - 1)K_X + A - B$ is ample, and
- $0 \leq \deg B|_H \ll 1$.

Set $D_k := kH + (m - 1)K_X + A - B$. Since $(m - 1)K_X + A - B$ is ample, so is D_k . By Lemma 2.11, we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(X, K_X + H + B + p^e D_k) & \longrightarrow & H^0(H, K_H + B|_H + p^e D_k|_H) \\ \downarrow \text{Tr}_{X, H+B}(D_k) & & \downarrow \text{Tr}_{H, B}(D_k) \\ H^0(X, K_X + H + B + D_k) & \longrightarrow & H^0(H, K_H + B|_H + D_k|_H), \end{array}$$

where $K_X + H + B + D_k = (k + 1)H + mK_X + A$.

By Serre vanishing, $H^1(X, K_X + B + p^e D_k) = 0$ for $e \gg 0$, and so the upper horizontal arrow is surjective. Further, since

$$\begin{aligned} \deg D_k|_H &= \deg(K_H + ((k - 1)H + (m - 2)K_X + A - B)|_H) \\ &> \frac{2g(H) - 2}{p} + \deg B|_H \end{aligned}$$

the middle vertical arrow $\mathrm{Tr}_{H,B}(D_k)$ is surjective as well, by Proposition 2.12 (see also Remark 2.13).

Therefore, the lower horizontal arrow is surjective. Since

$$H^1(H, K_H + B|_H + D_k|_H) = 0,$$

the claim holds by considering the long exact sequence of cohomologies:

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(X, \underbrace{K_X + B + D_K}_{kH+mK_X+A}) \longrightarrow H^1(X, \underbrace{K_X + H + B + D_k}_{(k+1)H+mK_X+A}) \longrightarrow 0.$$

□

This, together with Theorem 1.2, implies the following corollary.

Corollary 7.1. *Let X be a projective surface with Kawamata log terminal singularities defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 5$. Assume that mK_X is Cartier for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for an ample Cartier divisor A , the Cartier divisor*

$$H := 18mK_X + 62mA$$

is very ample and $H^i(X, H) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$.

8. BOUNDS ON LOG DEL PEZZO PAIRS

The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 1.5. We need the following facts.

Proposition 8.1. *Let (X, Δ) be an ϵ -klt log del Pezzo pair for $0 < \epsilon < 3^{-1/2}$. Let $\pi: \overline{X} \rightarrow X$ be the minimal resolution. Then*

- (a) $0 \leq (K_X + \Delta)^2 \leq \max\left(9, \lfloor 2/\epsilon \rfloor + 4 + \frac{4}{\lfloor 2/\epsilon \rfloor}\right)$,
- (b) $\mathrm{rk} \mathrm{Pic}(\overline{X}) \leq 128(1/\epsilon)^5$,
- (c) $2 \leq -E^2 \leq 2/\epsilon$ for any exceptional curve E of $\pi: \overline{X} \rightarrow X$,
- (d) if m is the $\mathbb{Q}$ -factorial index at some point $x \in X$, then

$$m \leq 2(2/\epsilon)^{128/\epsilon^5}.$$

Proof. Point (a) follows from [12, Theorem 1.3]. Points (b) and (c) follow from [2, Corollary 1.10] and [2, Lemma 1.2], respectively. Last, (d) follows from the fact that the Cartier index of a divisor divides the determinant of the intersection matrix of the minimal resolution of a singularity (see also the paragraph below [18, Theorem A]). □

Further, we need to prove the following:

Lemma 8.2. *Let (X, Δ) be a klt log del Pezzo pair such that $m(K_X + \Delta)$ is Cartier for some natural number $m \geq 2$. Then*

- (1) $0 \leq (K_X + \Delta)K_X \leq 3m \max\left(9, 2m + 4 + \frac{2}{m}\right)$, and
- (2) $|K_X^2| \leq 128m^5(2m - 1)$.

Recall that if a log del Pezzo pair (X, Δ) , with Cartier index m , is klt, then it must be $1/m$ -klt.

Proof. The non-negativity in (1) is clear, since

$$(K_X + \Delta)K_X = (K_X + \Delta)^2 - (K_X + \Delta)\Delta \geq 0.$$

Further, by cone theorem, $K_X - 3m(K_X + \Delta)$ is nef, and thus

$$(K_X + \Delta) \cdot (K_X - 3m(K_X + \Delta)) \leq 0.$$

This, together with (a) in Proposition 8.1, implies (1).

To prove (2), we proceed as follows. Let $\pi: \overline{X} \rightarrow X$ be the minimal resolution of singularities of X . By (b) in Proposition 8.1, we have $\text{rk Pic}(\overline{X}) \leq 128m^5$, and so $-9 \leq -K_{\overline{X}}^2 \leq 128m^5$. Indeed, the self intersection of the canonical bundle on a minimal model of a rational surface is 8 or 9, and each blow-up decreases it by one.

Write

$$K_{\overline{X}} + \sum a_i E_i = \pi^* K_X,$$

where E_i are the exceptional divisors of π . Notice, that since $\overline{X} \rightarrow X$ is minimal and X is klt, we have $0 \leq a_i < 1$. By applying (b) and (c) from Proposition 8.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |K_{\overline{X}}^2| &= |(K_{\overline{X}} + \sum a_i E_i) \cdot K_{\overline{X}}| \\ &\leq |K_{\overline{X}}|^2 + 128m^5(2m - 2) \\ &\leq 128m^5(2m - 1). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Corollary 1.5. By Proposition 8.1, the $\mathbb{Q}$ -factorial index of X is bounded with respect to ϵ . Indeed, the $\mathbb{Q}$ -factorial index is bounded at each point by (d), and the number of singular points is bounded by (b). Hence, we can assume that there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ bounded with respect to ϵ and I , such that mK_X , $m\Delta$, and $m(K_X + \Delta)$ are Cartier.

Set $a = 18m$ and $b = 62m^2$. By Corollary 7.1, the divisor $H := aK_X - b(K_X + \Delta)$ is very ample, and $H^i(X, H) = 0$ for $i > 0$. Proposition 8.1(a) and Lemma 8.2 imply that H^2 , $|H \cdot K_X|$, $H \cdot \Delta$, $|K_X \cdot \Delta|$, and $|\Delta^2|$ are bounded with respect to m .

The ample divisor H embeds X into a projective space of dimension $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X(H)) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(H))$, which is bounded with respect to m by the Riemann-Roch theorem.

□

If mK_X and $m(K_X + \Delta)$ are Cartier for $m > 1$, then one can easily calculate, that is enough to take

$$b(\epsilon, I) = \left(a^2 + b^2\right) \left(128m^5(2m - 1) + \max\left(9, 2m + 4 + \frac{2}{m}\right)\right),$$

where $a = 18m$ and $b = 62m^2$.

Remark 8.3. Corollary 1.5 and the Riemann-Roch theorem for surfaces with rational singularities imply that the absolute values of the coefficients of the Hilbert polynomial of X with respect to H are bounded with respect to ϵ and I . Further, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $n\Delta$ is Cartier. Then the absolute

values of the coefficients of the Hilbert polynomial of $n\Delta$ with respect to $H|_{n\Delta}$ are bounded with respect to ϵ , I , and n . Indeed,

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_{n\Delta}(mH)) = mn\Delta \cdot H - \frac{1}{2}n\Delta \cdot (n\Delta + K_X)$$

for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, by the Riemann-Roch theorem and the adjunction formula.

Remark 8.4. One of the reasons for our interest in the above corollary is that it provides bounds on ϵ -klt log del Pezzo surfaces which are independent of the characteristic. In particular, it shows the existence of a bounded family of ϵ -klt log del Pezzo surfaces over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ (see [4, Lemma 3.1]). We were not able to verify whether Kollár's bounds depend on the characteristic or not. We believe that stating explicit bounds might ease the life of future researches, wanting to handle questions related to the behavior of log del Pezzo surfaces in mix characteristic or for big enough characteristic.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my enormous gratitude to Paolo Cascini for his indispensable help. His guidance and suggestions played a crucial role in my research.

Further, I would like to thank Hiromu Tanaka for our ample discussions, from which I benefited immensely. I am grateful to him for allowing me to use his unpublished result in this paper. I also thank Roland Abuaf, Andrea Fanelli, and Ching-Jui Lai for comments and helpful suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Alexeev, *Boundedness and k^2 for log surfaces*, Internat. J. Math. **5** (1994), no. 6, 779–810. MR1298994 (95k:14048)
- [2] V. Alexeev and S. Mori, *Bounding singular surfaces of general type* (2004), 143–174. MR2037085 (2005f:14077)
- [3] J. Bertin, J.-P. Demailly, L. Illusie, and C. Peters, *Introduction to Hodge theory*, SMF/AMS Texts and Monographs, vol. 8, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2002. Translated from the 1996 French original by James Lewis and Peters. MR1924513 (2003g:14009)
- [4] P. Cascini, H. Tanaka, and J. Witaszek, *On log del Pezzo surfaces in large characteristic*, Preprint (2015).
- [5] P. Cascini, H. Tanaka, and C. Xu, *On base point freeness in positive characteristic*, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. **48** (2015), no. 5, 1239–1272.
- [6] G. Di Cerbo and A. Fanelli, *Effective Matsusaka's Theorem for surfaces in characteristic p* , ArXiv e-prints (2015), available at [arXiv:1501.07299v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/1501.07299v2). To appear in Algebra & Number Theory.
- [7] C. D. Hacon and C. Xu, *On the three dimensional minimal model program in positive characteristic*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), no. 3, 711–744. MR3327534
- [8] N. Hara, *A characterization of rational singularities in terms of injectivity of Frobenius maps*, Amer. J. Math. **120** (1998), no. 5, 981–996. MR1646049 (99h:13005)
- [9] ———, *Classification of two-dimensional F -regular and F -pure singularities*, Adv. Math. **133** (1998), no. 1, 33–53. MR1492785 (99a:14048)
- [10] ———, *A characteristic p analog of multiplier ideals and applications*, Comm. Algebra **33** (2005), no. 10, 3375–3388. MR2175438 (2006f:13006)
- [11] N. Hara and K.-I. Watanabe, *F -regular and F -pure rings vs. log terminal and log canonical singularities*, J. Algebraic Geom. **11** (2002), no. 2, 363–392. MR1874118 (2002k:13009)
- [12] C. Jiang, *Bounding the volumes of singular weak log del Pezzo surfaces*, Internat. J. Math. **24** (2013), no. 13, 1350110, 27. MR3158579

- [13] N. M. Katz, *Nilpotent connections and the monodromy theorem: Applications of a result of Turrittin*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **39** (1970), 175–232. MR0291177 (45 #271)
- [14] D. S. Keeler, *Fujita’s conjecture and Frobenius amplitude*, Amer. J. Math. **130** (2008), no. 5, 1327–1336. MR2450210 (2009i:14006)
- [15] J. Kollár, *Toward moduli of singular varieties*, Compositio Math. **56** (1985), no. 3, 369–398. MR814554 (87e:14009)
- [16] ———, *Effective base point freeness*, Math. Ann. **296** (1993), no. 4, 595–605. MR1233485 (94f:14004)
- [17] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti; Translated from the 1998 Japanese original. MR1658959 (2000b:14018)
- [18] C.-J. Lai, *Bounding the volumes of singular Fano threefolds*, ArXiv e-prints (2012), available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.2593v1>. To appear in Nagoya Math. Journal.
- [19] A. Langer, *Adjoint linear systems on normal log surfaces*, Compositio Math. **129** (2001), no. 1, 47–66. MR1856022 (2002h:14008)
- [20] R. Lazarsfeld, *Positivity in algebraic geometry. i*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics], vol. 48, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. Classical setting: line bundles and linear series. MR2095471 (2005k:14001a)
- [21] ———, *Positivity in algebraic geometry. ii*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics], vol. 49, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. Positivity for vector bundles, and multiplier ideals. MR2095472 (2005k:14001b)
- [22] D. Martinelli, Y. Nakamura, and J. Witaszek, *On the basepoint-free theorem for log canonical threefolds over the algebraic closure of a finite field*, Algebra Number Theory **9** (2015), no. 3, 725–747. MR3340549
- [23] T. Matsusaka, *Polarized varieties with a given Hilbert polynomial*, Amer. J. Math. **94** (1972), 1027–1077. MR0337960 (49 #2729)
- [24] I. Reider, *Vector bundles of rank 2 and linear systems on algebraic surfaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **127** (1988), no. 2, 309–316. MR932299 (89e:14038)
- [25] F. Sakai, *Reider-Serrano’s method on normal surfaces*, Algebraic geometry (L’Aquila, 1988), 1990, pp. 301–319. MR1040564 (91d:14001)
- [26] K. Schwede, *F-singularities and Frobenius splitting notes*, available at <http://www.math.utah.edu/~schwede/frob/RunningTotal.pdf>.
- [27] ———, *F-adjunction*, Algebra Number Theory **3** (2009), no. 8, 907–950. MR2587408 (2011b:14006)
- [28] ———, *A canonical linear system associated to adjoint divisors in characteristic $p > 0$* , J. Reine Angew. Math. **696** (2014), 69–87. MR3276163
- [29] K. Schwede and K. Tucker, *A survey of test ideals* (2012), 39–99. MR2932591
- [30] N. I. Shepherd-Barron, *Unstable vector bundles and linear systems on surfaces in characteristic p* , Invent. Math. **106** (1991), no. 2, 243–262. MR1128214 (92h:14027)
- [31] K. E. Smith, *Fujita’s freeness conjecture in terms of local cohomology*, J. Algebraic Geom. **6** (1997), no. 3, 417–429. MR1487221 (98m:14002)
- [32] ———, *A tight closure proof of Fujita’s freeness conjecture for very ample line bundles*, Math. Ann. **317** (2000), no. 2, 285–293. MR1764238 (2001e:14006)
- [33] S. Takagi, *Fujita’s approximation theorem in positive characteristics*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **47** (2007), no. 1, 179–202. MR2359108 (2008i:14014)
- [34] H. Tanaka, *Minimal models and abundance for positive characteristic log surfaces*, Nagoya Math. J. **216** (2014), 1–70. MR3319838
- [35] ———, *The trace map of Frobenius and extending sections for threefolds*, Michigan Math. J. **64** (2015), no. 2, 227–261. MR3359024

- [36] ———, *The X-method for KLT surfaces in positive characteristic*, J. Algebraic Geom. **24** (2015), no. 4, 605–628. MR3383599
- [37] H. Tango, *On the behavior of extensions of vector bundles under the Frobenius map*, Nagoya Math. J. **48** (1972), 73–89. MR0314851 (47 #3401)
- [38] H. Terakawa, *The d -very ampleness on a projective surface in positive characteristic*, Pacific J. Math. **187** (1999), no. 1, 187–199. MR1674325 (99m:14014)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE, LONDON, 180 QUEEN'S GATE,
LONDON SW7 2AZ, UK

E-mail address: j.witaszek14@imperial.ac.uk